arXiv:quant-ph/0409197v2 14 Feb 2005

email[]g.mardari@rutgers.edu

An alternative to quantum complementarity

Ghenadie N. Mardari
Rutgers University, 89 George St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

The natural state of an unmeasured quantum system can be described by two competing types of hypotheses. One is the lottery model, according to which the system is constantly fluctuating, as if being in many states at once, until the measurement collapses it. The other stems from a roulette analogy, where the measurement alone induces a chaotic shift from one defined state to another. Both the Copenhagen interpretation and the de-Broigle-Bohm realism are based on the lottery model. Yet, the latest experimental data contradict its implications beyond reasonable doubt. A likely solution is to interpret the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics with a roulette model.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 11.27.+d, 42.50.Xa

The formalism of quantum mechanics is one of the greatest achievements of modern science. Yet, its interpretation is still a matter of debate. For example, it is well-known that some pairs of observables must be described by non-commuting operators. By implication, only one of the two can have an exact solution with real numbers at the same time. So, according to the Copenhagen interpretation, one observable must have no identifiable real qualities, when the other is fully detected. Despite the far-reaching success of this approach, it is becoming increasingly difficult to defend, given the results of several recent experiments. Hence, Santori *et al.* have proven the reality of interference between single photons emitted by independent deterministic sources [1]. This should have been impossible, according to the energy-time complementarity. In this case, *time* is described by the phase and *energy* by the number of photons. Deterministic sources of photons produce squeezed states of light, in which the number of quanta is certain, and phase coherence should be impossible to achieve. Therefore, interference should have been undetectable, but it was clearly demonstrated.

Similar proofs exist against the postulated complementarity between path knowledge and fringe visibility in interferometric settings. Several recent experiments have demonstrated interference between non-intersecting coherent beams of single photons [2, 3, 4]. These experiments have produced interference that evidently could not be explained in terms of local particle collisions. Nevertheless, which-path information was well-defined, because the two beams did not overlap. Thus, path knowledge did not destroy interference. In fact, even the famous wave-particle complementarity is under fire. The latest experiments of Afshar have proven conclusively the reality of wave effects, when particle properties alone should have been detected [5]. In this context, it is remarkable that the Michelson-Morley experiment was specifically designed to detect a wave property of light, but failed. This shows that wave properties do not simply become manifest when they can be detected. Looking in the right place is just as important as how to look. Consequently, waves and particles — like many other complementary observables — are very likely to have a real co-existence that is not anticipated by the Copenhagen interpretation.

It is very important to emphasize that these inconsistencies do not stem from the formalism of quantum mechanics. The quantitative concepts are abstract by definition. It is the role of interpretations to decide what should apply to what. The Copenhagen interpretation insists that quantum properties are meaningless prior to measurement, and often ignores their causal potential. This peculiarity is most likely a consequence of its interpretation of the probabilistic nature of quantum-mechanical observables. This non-classical approach is based on a *lottery* model of underdetermination, which implies that unmeasured states have multiple values at the same time, the function of measurement being to choose one at random. Yet, there is at least one other way to explain uncertainty. This is the *roulette* model, according to which the system has only well defined states, one at a time, but the act of measurement induces random shifts, due to the chaotic nature of its unavoidable impact on the observable.

Note that the de-Broigle-Bohm realism [6], which is the most successful alternative to the Copenhagen interpretation, is also based on the lottery model. Hence, the hypothesis of hidden local variables leads to Bell's inequality [7], because they are presumed to require separable factors for their correlations. One has to assume that prior common factors are not real, and that local variables cannot stop fluctuating without non-local collapse, for this to be necessary. Given this limitation, the pilot-wave theory could not simplify our understanding, despite its intuitive appeal. On the other hand, if alternative assumptions are allowed for consideration, the hypothesis of hidden local variables does not lead necessarily to Bell's theorem [8].

According to the roulette model, quantum properties must be assumed to be always well-defined in reality, despite their selective manifestation through measurement. For example, the wave-particle dualism can be solved by assuming that quanta are particles, surrounded by waves in some sort of medium. In this context, the detectable speed of light must be determined by particle motion. Therefore, its invariance cannot be used for generalizations about the wave properties of fields. When Michelson and Morley performed their influential experiments, there were no reasons yet to consider the possibility of photons. With the emergence of quantum mechanics, their conclusions have acquired a limited validity. In other words, mediation is still a valid scientific hypothesis. In order to falsify it, the speed of electrostatic and magnetostatic pulses must be proven to be invariant as well.

Furthermore, when statistical phenomena are tackled with a roulette model, quantum mechanics must be treated as a classical theory. This makes it possible for us to appeal to macroscopic analogies for the explanation of fundamental processes. Consider, for example, the motion of a boat, which creates waves with predictable wavelength on a given aquatic surface. If the boat were to pass through a gate that is narrower than the wavelength, it would have to be perfectly equidistant from the two edges, in order to maintain a straight trajectory. The slightest deviation from the central point would result in uneven instant recoil from each side, causing a change in velocity. The narrower the gate — the wider the dispersion of likely trajectories after this "measurement". It is quite plausible that a similar process governs the probabilistic distribution of detected photons during diffraction experiments. The analogy can even be extended to the analysis of interference. Hence, when many boats move in the same direction on a common surface, they must experience lateral trajectory deviations, as if surfing on each other's waves. Yet, the opposite slopes of two adjacent waves must cancel out their effects near the points of constructive interference. Consequently, all boats should behave as if guided towards equilibrium lines crossing the peaks of constructive interference. When many boats are launched out of the same gate, diffraction alone should be detectable, because all waves are concentric. When two or more gates are used, the boats must create interfering waves, and end up clustering in predictable ways. Similarly, particles can build up interference fringes during interferometric experiments, without colliding directly with each other. And, given the necessary reaction of the medium to the presence of any particle, interference patterns should be sensitive to any attempt to observe the process directly.

If quanta are treated as real particles, self-interference must be ruled out. A particle cannot be in two places at once, nor can it exhibit interference due to its own waves. This process requires at least two particles with independent pathways, which must also be close enough for interaction. Consequently, there must be a limit, beyond which interference should vanish in the single photon regime. This prediction has been confirmed by a recent experiment of Kim *et al.* with a Young-type interferometric setting [9]. Using the signal beam of a parametric down converter (and discarding the idler), the authors controlled the distance between pairs of photons, iterated at $90MHz$, and checked for fringe visibility. Similarity with the double-slit experiment was ensured by the relatively large area of emission, which implied that photons were emerging from various points, as if from different slits. This also meant that fringes from different source-points would overlap, washing out visibility. Therefore, narrow-band interference filters were required. The reported result is that fringe visibility dropped very quickly, as the delay between photons approached the picosecond range. We believe that this finding does not contradict previous experiments, but only their interpretation. Earlier tests, which produced interference beyond nanosecond intervals [10, 11], relied on attenuated light sources, without being able to control the length of single photons. Still, even such settings were shown to produce no interference, when light attenuation was much stronger [12]. The same conclusion holds for experiments with electrons as well. In their famous demonstration of single-electron interference in a two-slit setting, Tonomura *et al.* [13] reported a loss of fringe contrast at lower emission intensities. They attributed this feature to the possibility of a systemic measurement error. Nevertheless, this still means that the evidence in favor of self-interference is inconclusive.

The lottery model was not able provide a single explanation for all types of interference. For the simple double-slit experiment, reference was made to self-interference. For interference between photons from isolated sources, the explanation was given in terms of entanglement. The problem was that some settings were ambiguous. Hence, in a Young interferometer, in which the slits are switched on alternatively very fast [14], only one path is open at a time and the process resembles the situations with two independent sources of photons. Yet, entanglement does not apply, and explanation is given in terms of self-interference. The switching mechanism works faster than the uncertainty in times of detection, facilitating the assumption that the two paths are indistinguishable in the interference volume. Remarkably, path distinguishability depends here on the average interval between single photons. As shown above, the roulette approach can explain all types of interference by reference to the latter.

Where the lottery model required a complementary relationship between self-interference and entanglement, the roulette approach makes a distinction between electric and magnetic photon interactions. For example, when two photons are temporally distinguishable, their magnetic waves must propagate in parallel planes. Thus, the role of polarization should become insignificant. In contrast, the interaction via electric waves should acquire primary importance, as revealed by the dependency of fringe visibility on phase-coherence. This prediction is confirmed to the letter by a recent experiment of Kim and Grice [15], which analyzed the details of photon bunching with identical photons, well separated in time. First of all, they found that interference vanishes altogether, when separation is increased towards the picosecond range. Secondly, they found that fringe visibility at smaller delays between photons depends on subwavelength tweaking, *i.e.* on phase coherence. Finally, they came to the firm conclusion that polarization was irrelevant for the outcome of the experiment, after many iterations with varied adjustments. Such photonic behavior is in stark contrast with the settings that involve simultaneous pulses, when phase coherence is not an issue, but polarization is the crucial factor for fringe visibility. Parametric down-conversion is a good source of polarization-determined interactions. Though, few experiments are so revealing as the tests of the hypothetical quantum erasure.

A very interesting test of quantum erasure was performed by Walborn *et al.* [16]. The authors directed polarization-entangled pairs of simultaneous identical photons along different paths. One photon (called p) went straight to its detector (a photon counter), while the other (s) was sent through a double-slit interferometer. The two slits were covered by orthogonal polarizers, designated as path markers, and therefore no interference was expected. The authors claim that interference was recovered when the polarization of p particles was measured. Moreover, this had to work even when the p particles were detected after the s particles, and the fringes were already recorded. Quantum erasure follows logically from the principles of the Copenhagen interpretation, but it is difficult to accept in terms of the experiment itself. First of all, the recovered fringes did not correspond to the whole pool of photons that passed the interferometer. The technique of coincidence counts merely separated the detection events into a set with fringes, and another with antifringes, which could create back the non-interference distribution when added. It is quite plausible that the two interference subsets were there even when the p photons were counted without polarization measurements. Secondly, it is not clear why the process only worked one way. If quantum erasure is real, the s photons could have acted on the p photons too, washing out fringe visibility, particularly during the so-called delayed erasure. Thirdly, it was not proven that the fringes were indeed produced by the self-interference of s photons. This could have been done by demonstrating the build-up of fringes with the beam of p photons discarded at emission, and without polarization markers. The existing data rules out self-interference, because the fringe patterns correlate strongly with the presence of p photons. Hence, all fringes are strikingly asymmetric in the case of early detection of p photons, with or without polarization markers, and less so during delayed measurement. There is no reason for such asymmetry under the assumption of self-interference. Yet, the assumption of direct interaction requires them. When p photons were detected too early, their interaction with s photons had to be imperfect, producing a poorer dispersion of their intensity. Finally, there is sufficient evidence from other sources for the possibility of direct $s-p$ interaction, leading to fringe build-up. Such interference appears to be a normal property of simultaneous identical photons following adjacent paths [2, 3, 4]. Moreover, in a similar test of quantum erasure, Schwindt *et al.* demonstrated recovery “even when no which-way information was available to erase” [17]. That is to say, they showed that polarization markers produced separate sets of fringes at various mutual angles, regardless of their potential to affect the level of which-path information. The crucial element for interaction was the presence of simultaneous polarization-entangled photons. In terms of the details of the experiment, the s photons were well-positioned to interfere directly with the p photons. This means that the p photons were not forced to change alignment at measurement. They arrived already at the right angle to be detectable in coincidence counts with the s particles that they interfered with. This also means that the fringes were produced by s photons taking one path, and the antifringes corresponded to those that went along the orthogonal path.

In light of the above, the interpretation of quantum processes in terms of lottery models is no longer satisfactory. They lead to complicated generalizations, which have a limited predictive range and violate the experimental record. In contrast, the roulette approach produces verifiable explanations in classical terms that are uniquely able to fit the formalism and might even eliminate some inconsistencies between related branches of physics. Nevertheless, the hypothesis of real magnetic and electric waves necessarily brings up an old question: what are they waves of? The answer, we believe, has already been produced by recent astrophysical investigations. As it is known, quantum field theories could not provide a satisfactory answer to the problem of accelerated expansion of the Universe [18, 19], but the gap was filled in part by the brane-world cosmologies. Notably, some theories from the latter group are focused on the hypothesis that matter could be localized on a 3D domain wall, embedded in a higher-dimensional bulk [20, 21, 22]. So, particles can be described as moving inside a real brane and causing vibrations that propagate as magnetic and electric waves in superposition.

Brane scenarios are easily adaptable to the properties of optical processes. Hence, a domain wall can be defined as a three-dimensional architecture of interwoven elastic strings, governed by some sort of local symmetry. Whenever a photon has an impact on a string, it must produce a set of longitudinal brane waves along the direction of action, which obey the inverse square law, like the electric force. The same action must also generate an orthogonal transverse wave, which corresponds to the profile of the magnetic force. This fundamental unit of action must determine the value of Planck's constant, while the distance between any two strings must become the absolute unit of distance. Given the elasticity of the brane, this unit must be fundamentally flexible. Whenever photons travel through excited regions of the brane, they must behave as if embedded in a curved space, exhibiting well-known relativistic and electromagnetic properties.

This model has another unexpected advantage. Current theories explain many particle properties in terms of finite harmonic oscillators. Yet, harmonic oscillators must allow for continuous distributions of energy values, despite the assumption of integer number of wavelengths. When overtones are considered, the number of standing waves can increase infinitely, producing arbitrarily small values for energy units. Moreover, it is well known that such a mechanism cannot explain the probability of detecting a quantum in a given volume either. An oscillating body will have the smallest probability of detection in the middle, whereas the probability of quantum positions diminishes with distance from an identifiable center. In contrast, the brane can be treated as an infinite oscillating medium, which excludes the possibility of actual standing waves. Instead, the harmonic patterns must be produced by the sustained agency of a source — the particle, which plucks the strings of the brane. If so, the probability of finding the quantum agent must be the highest at the source (when time-evolution is ignored), and the energy of the waves can only be quantized. Hence, the brane scenario is uniquely suitable for the interpretation of the fundamental properties of matter. Note that it is mathematically convenient to treat the source points of waves as infinitesimals. Though, every unit of action must have an irreducible volume, defined by the product of wavelength and amplitude. There is no such thing as a fraction of a pluck. So, the real propagation of waves must begin at a well-defined distance from the conventional source-point, and the inverse (exponent) law must break down for energy estimates at subwavelength intervals from it. If this phenomenon is ignored, the fortuitous conclusion must be that finite action produces infinite energy very close to the source. Thus, non-classical interpretations in terms of probability waves often lead to unexplained singularities and infinities, predicting enormous forces among adjacent quanta. The hypothesis of moving particles, as uniform sources of real waves, is the only one known to us that can explain the quantized nature of field energy without inconsistencies.

As a corollary, the ontological gap between classical mechanics and quantum mechanics is merely a consequence of widespread adherence to lottery models of uncertainty. These models are non-local by definition and therefore offer no chance for consistency between macro and micro processes. On the other hand, classical interpretations of quantum phenomena are the only ones which appear to fit the data, being only consistent with the so-called roulette approach to uncertainty.

[1] C. Santori, D. Fattal, J. Vučković, G. Solomon, and Y. Yamamoto, Nature **419**, 594 (2002).
[2] E. Fonseca, P. Suoto Ribeiro, S. Pádua, and C. Monken, Phys. Rev. A **60(2)**, 1530 (1999).
[3] Z. Ou, X. Zou, L. Wang, and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65(3)**, 321 (1990).
[4] P. Kwiat, W. Vareka, C. Hong, H. Nathel, and R. Chiao, Phys. Rev. A **41(5)**, 2910 (1990).
[5] S. Afshar, http://www.irims.org/quant-ph/030503/.
[6] D. Bohm and B. Hiley, *The undivided universe* (Routledge, 1993).
[7] J. Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics* (Cambridge, 1987).
[8] A. Shafiee and M. Golshani, Fortschr. Phys. **53(1)**, 105 (2005).
[9] Y. Kim, M. Chekhova, S. Kulik, Y. Shih, and M. Rubin, Phys. Rev. A **61(5)**, 051803 (2000).
[10] S. Parker, Am. J. Phys. **39**, 420 (1971).
[11] S. Parker, Am. J. Phys. **40**, 1003 (1972).
[12] Y. Dontsov and A. Baz, Sov. Phys. - JETP **25(1)**, 1 (1967).
[13] A. Tonomura J. Endo, T. Matsuda, T. Kawasaki, and H. Ezawa, Am. J. Phys. **57(2)**, 117 (1989).
[14] R. Sillitto and C. Wykes, Phys. Lett. A **39(4)**, 333 (1972).
[15] Y. Kim and W. Grice, quant-ph/0304086.
[16] S. Walborn, M. Terra Cunha, S. Pádua, and C. Monken, Phys. Rev. A **65(3)**, 033818 (2002).
[17] P. Schwindt, P. Kwiat, and B. Englert, Phys. Rev. A **60(6)**, 4285 (1999).
[18] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61(1)**, 1 (1989).
[19] V. Sahni and A. Starobinski, J. Mod. Phys. D **9**, 373 (2000).
[20] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83(23)**, 4690 (1999).
[21] D. Langlois, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **148**, 181 (2003).
[22] P. Brax and C. van de Bruck, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, R201 (2003).